

Applicant : Michael Perani and Yong Joo Kil
Serial No. : 09/898,676
Filed : July 3, 2001
Page : 7 of 8

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-506001 / P469

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-12, 14, and 17-22 are pending. Reconsideration of the action mailed May 17, 2004, is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks. The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Maya Complete 2 ("Maya"). Applicant traverses the rejections.

The Examiner allowed claims 5-8, 10-12, 14, and 17-22. The Examiner objected to claim 9 as dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim. The Applicant appreciates the Examiner's recognition of allowable subject matter in claims 5-12, 14, and 17-22.

Section 112 Rejection

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is in error. Claim 1 was amended to incorporate information previously presented in claim 3, which was part of the originally filed application. No new subject matter was added. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Section 102(a) Rejection

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Maya. Claim 4 is directed to a computer program product that includes instructions to "receive from a user a precision input" and "in response, introduce additional control points to the original contained object if necessary to achieve the precision before applying the coordinate remapping."

The Examiner states that Maya discloses the recited feature of claim 4 on page 382. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Maya describes lattice deformation on page 382, however there is no discussion of introducing additional control points in response to a user's precision input. Maya does disclose that the user can "adjust the STU divisions of the lattice, giving it more or fewer lattice points than the default setting." See page 383, paragraph 3. In contrast, the user in claim 4 only inputs a precision. In response to the precision input, the computer program

Applicant : Michael Perani and Yong Joo Kil
Serial No. : 09/898,676
Filed : July 3, 2001
Page : 8 of 8

Attorney's Docket No.: 07844-506001 / P469


product introduces additional control points "if necessary to achieve the precision." Maya does not disclose or suggest this feature of claim 4.

The Examiner further states in his Response to Arguments that claim 4 "does not say that the computer introduces additional control points in response to the user's input, therefore the user could add more points as MAYA does." Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 4 requires that the computer program product receive a precision input from a user. Claim 4 also requires that the computer program product introduce additional control points in response to the precision input. It is clear from the claim language that it is the computer program product, not the user, introducing additional control points depending on the level of precision set by the user. For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 4 is allowable.

Applicant respectfully requests that all pending claims be allowed. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11 August, 2004



Brian J. Gustafson
Reg. No. 52,978

Customer Number 021876
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50221482.doc